

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending, and stand rejected.

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended. Applicants submit that the original specification provides antecedent basis for these amendments and no new matter has been added.

Claims 1- 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Specifically, the Office asserts that it is not clear what is meant by “selected signal portions that have overlapping addresses” and “to reallocate addresses of the signal portions so there is no overlap.” (Office Action at page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification clearly describes that “incoming signals are likely to have components using the same identifier or address[, which] may be the same broadcast received from two separate suppliers or it may be two or more different broadcasts.” (Page 2, lines 27-30). The specification also describes “each remultiplexer being configured to determine those signal portions that have overlapping addresses, to reallocate addresses of the signal portions so there is no overlap[.]” (Page 3, line 30 – page 4, line1). The specification also provides “each [portion] corresponding to a broadcast or provided service.” (Page 4, lines 28-29). As such, the meaning of “selected signal portions that have overlapping addresses” and “to reallocate addresses of the signal portions so there is no overlap” is clear.

A simple example may help illustrate the above cited description. Suppose a decoder of the claimed invention receives signals A and B from

different signal sources C and D, respectively. Signal A, B include portions E, F, respectively, which both correspond to channel X, and portions E, F may be selected by the demultiplexiers. As such, portions E and F may have the same identifier or address, i.e., overlapping address, because they both correspond to channel X. In this case, the remultiplexiers will identify the overlapping address, and reallocate addresses for portions E and F such that there is no overlap. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the meaning of “selected signal portions that have overlapping addresses” and “to reallocate addresses of the signal portions so there is no overlap” is clear and definite. A person skilled in the art will clearly understand the claimed subject matter.

Nevertheless, by this Amendment, the specification has been amended to further clarify the meaning of “selected signal portions that have overlapping addresses” and “to reallocate addresses of the signal portions so there is no overlap.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John A. Merecki', enclosed within a rectangular box.

Date: 7/10/2006

John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)